

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed October 30, 2008, claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected. Additionally, the drawings are objected to. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10, canceled claim 9, added claims 12-20, and filed herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments, the new claims, the RCE, and the below-provided remarks.

### Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action states that the blank boxes of figures 1 and 5, in particular, boxes 101 and 501, need descriptive labels. The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The labeling of figures with text matter is prohibited under PCT Rule 11.11, except when absolutely indispensable for understanding. Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that “[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11).” In the present application, Applicants submit that the addition of text labels to the drawings is not “absolutely indispensable” because the individual drawing elements such as elements 101 and 501 are identified by reference numbers and described in the specification. In particular, element 101 is described in the specification at, for example, page 2, line 30 and identified as representing a “reference voltage generation circuit.” Element 501 is described in the specification at, for example, page 8, line 29 and identified as representing “digital circuit.”

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that additional descriptive labels are not needed for elements 101 and 501 in figures 1 and 5. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Brokaw (U.S. Pat. No. 5,917,311). In response, claims 1 and 10 have been amended, claim 9 has been canceled, and claims 12-20 have been added. Applicants

respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated by Brokaw for the reasons provided below.

#### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite in part a voltage regulator for generating an output voltage in dependence of a reference signal and “*outputting the output voltage through an output terminal*” and that “*the output terminal is not connected to the external terminal.*” Support for the amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose that “*the output terminal is not connected to the external terminal*” as recited in amended claim 1. On the contrary, Brokaw discloses the opposite of the above-identified limitation.

In particular, Brokaw discloses that a voltage regulator includes an amplifier (50) and a resistive feedback network (54), see Fig. 3 and column 3, lines 49-59. The voltage regulator in Fig. 3 processes the output of the amplifier (50) and produces an output voltage ( $V_{out}$ ) at a terminal connected to the resistive feedback network (54). The resistive feedback network (54) divides down the output voltage ( $V_{out}$ ) to produce a voltage ( $V_{fb}$ ), which is fed back to the amplifier (50). That is, Brokaw discloses that the output terminal for the output voltage ( $V_{out}$ ) of the voltage regulator in Fig. 3 is connected to the external terminal of the resistive feedback network (54).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Brokaw.

#### Dependent Claims 3-8

Claim 9 has been canceled. Claims 3-8 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-8 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claim 4 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 4 recites in part that “*said reference signal generation circuit comprises a further comparator with an input connected to a further internal terminal out of said sub-*

*set of internal terminals for comparing said selection signal with a further threshold signal and an output connected to said selection circuit.”* Brokaw discloses that the amplifier (50) drives a pass transistor (Q1), which is connected to the resistive feedback network (54), see Fig. 3 and column 3, lines 49-59. However, Brokaw does not disclose that more than one comparator connects with the resistive feedback network (54) and compares the output voltage ( $V_{out}$ ) from the voltage regulator in Fig. 3 with threshold values. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 4.

#### Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1. Support for the amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. As amended, claim 10 includes similar limitations to amended claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 10, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claim 1 apply also to amended claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 10 is not anticipated by Brokaw.

#### Dependent Claim 11

Claim 11 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 10. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 11 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10.

#### New Claims 12-20

Claims 12-20 has been added. Support for claim 12 is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, original claim 1, Fig. 5, and the paragraph between page 8 and page 9. Support for claim 13 is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, original claims 1, 4, and 10. Support for claim 14 is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, original claims 1, 5, and 10. Support for claims 15 and 16 is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, original claim 10 and page 8, lines 6-12. Support for claims 17 and 18 is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example,

original claims 1 and 9 and Figs. 3 and 4. Support for claims 19 and 20 is found in Applicants' specification at, for example, original claim 10, Fig. 5, and the paragraph between page 8 and page 9.

Claims 12-16 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 10. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 12-16 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10. Additionally, claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 12 recites in part that “*said reference signal generation circuit comprises a comparator with a non-inverting input connected to an internal terminal out of a sub-set of the internal terminals for comparing said selection signal with a threshold signal supplied through an inverting input of said comparator and an output connected to said selection circuit.*” Brokaw discloses that the amplifier (50) drives the pass transistor (Q1) connected to the resistive feedback network (54), see Fig. 3 and column 3, lines 49-59. However, Brokaw does not disclose that the pass transistor (Q1) connects to the resistive feedback network (54) through a non-inverting input of the pass transistor (Q1). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 12.

Claim 13 includes similar limitations to claim 4. Because of the similarities between claim 13 and claim 4, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claim 4 apply also to claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 13.

Claim 15 recites in part that “*said external terminal of said integrated circuit is an internal terminal of an integrated circuit package, said external terminal of said integrated circuit being connected to an external terminal of said integrated circuit package.*” Claim 16 recites in part that “*said terminals of said integrated circuit are bond pads, said external terminal of said integrated circuit is a lead finger, and said external terminal of said integrated circuit package is a pin.*” Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose the above-identified limitations of claims 15 and 16.

Claim 17 recites in part that “*a voltage regulator for generating an output voltage in dependence of a first reference voltage and a second reference voltage, characterized in that a band-gap voltage reference circuit is provided for generating said first*

*reference voltage and a reference voltage generation circuit is provided for generating said second reference voltage comprising a plurality of inputs connected to internal terminals, whereby a sub-set of said plurality internal terminals is connected to an external terminal, said first reference voltage being supplied at a non-inverting input of said voltage regulator, and said second reference voltage being supplied at an inverting input of said voltage regulator*”(emphasis added). Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose the above-identified limitations of claim 17. On the contrary, Brokaw discloses the opposite of the above-identified limitation. In particular, Brokaw discloses that an inverting input of the amplifier (50) is connected to ground and a non-inverting input of the amplifier (50) is connected to the resistive feedback network (54), see Fig. 3 and column 3, lines 49-59.

Claim 18 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 17. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 18 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 17.

Claims 19 and 20 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 19 and 20 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claim 19 includes similar limitations to claim 12. Because of the similarities between claim 19 and claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claim 12 apply also to claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 19.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Petition is hereby made under 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the time for response to the Office Action of 01/30/2009 to and through 03/30/2009, comprising an extension of the shortened statutory period of two months.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: March 30, 2009

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111